REMARKS

In the Office Action,[1] the Examiner rejected claims 8-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112,

first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement; rejected

claims 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.

6,628,304 to Mitchell et al. ("*Mitchell*") in view of IBM Redbooks Reference U -

"Fundamentals of Grid Computing" ("*IBM*"), and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitchell* and *IBM* in view of U.S. Publication No.

2001/0054034 to Arning et al. ("*Arning*").

By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 8-11, cancel claim 13 without

prejudice or disclaimer, and add new claims 14-21. Claims 8-12 and 14-21 are now

pending in this application.

The Telephonic Interview of December 3, 2008

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone interview of

November 25, 2008 with Applicants' representatives. Applicants' representatives

discussed the possibility of amending the claims as presented herein. The Examiner

agreed that these amendments would distinguish the claims from the cited references.

Further, the Examiner indicated that such amendments would receive favorable

consideration and appeared to recite allowable subject matter.

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related
art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants
decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Rejection of Claims 8–13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 8–13 under 35 U.S.C

§ 112, first paragraph. The Final Office Action alleges that certain recitations of claim 8

are unsupported by the specification (Final Office Action at p. 3). Applicants respectfully

disagree. Nevertheless, the amendments to claim 8 presented herein delete the

allegedly unsupported subject matter, and claim 8 is fully supported by the specification.

Claims 9-13 were apparently rejected solely due to their dependence from

independent claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to

reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 8–13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first

paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 8–12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 8–12 under 35 U.S.C

§ 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear

articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. *See*

M.P.E.P. § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (Sept. 2007). Such an analysis should be made

explicit and cannot be premised upon mere conclusory statements. *See* id. "A

conclusion of obviousness requires that the reference(s) relied upon be enabling in that

it put the public in possession of the claimed invention." M.P.E.P. § 2145. Furthermore,

"[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the

resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of

ordinary skill in the art" at the time the invention was made. M.P.E.P. § 2143.01(III),

internal citation omitted. Moreover, "[i]n determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious." M.P.E.P. § 2141.02(I), internal citations omitted (emphasis in original).

"[T]he framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1996) . . . . The factual inquires . . . [include determining the scope and content of the prior art and] . . . [a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2141(II). "Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art." M.P.E.P. § 2141(III).

Claim 1, for example, recites a method comprising providing feedback from grid managers about a grid network, and "displaying, based on the feedback [from the grid managers] ... columns representing the resources and having intersections with the rows, wherein the intersections between columns and the rows include indications of the services running on the resources" (emphasis added).

Mitchell discloses a method and apparatus for presenting hierarchical data to a user via a graphical user interface (*Mitchell*, abstract). *Mitchell* describes various graphical user interfaces corresponding to FIGS. 3-6 (*Mitchell*, col. 8, line 1 to col. 12, line 37). However, *Mitchell's* figures do not include "columns," "rows," or "intersections" between columns and rows. Therefore, *Mitchell* does not teach or suggest "displaying,

based on the feedback [from the grid managers] ... columns representing the resources and having intersections with the rows, wherein <u>the intersections between columns and the rows include indications of the services running on the resources</u>" (emphasis added), as recited by independent claim 8.

IBM fails to cure these deficiencies of *Mitchell*. *IBM* includes a general discussion of grid computing (*IBM*, p. 3). *IBM* also includes an image of an administrator viewing a computer screen and adjusting grid policies (*IBM*, p. 8). However, *IBM's* illustrations do not include a figure with "columns," "rows," or "intersections" between columns and rows. Therefore, *IBM* does not teach or suggest "displaying, based on the feedback [from the grid managers] ... columns representing the resources and having intersections with the rows, wherein <u>the intersections between columns and the rows include indications of the services running on the resources</u>" (emphasis added), as recited by independent claim 8.

For at least the above reasons, the cited references do not render obvious claim 8, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and allow independent claim 8.

Claims 9-12 depend from claim 8. These dependent claims are allowable at least due to their dependence on the independent claim. Accordingly, the Examiner should also withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 9-12 and allow these dependent claims.

Rejection of Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over *Mitchell* in view of *IBM* and *Arning*. A *prima facie*

case of obviousness has not been established.

Claim 13 depends from claim 8, and therefore includes all of the subject matter

recited in their respective base claims. As discussed above with respect to claim 8,

Mitchell and *IBM* fail to teach or suggest the features of the independent claim.

Arning fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of *Mitchell* and *IBM*. *Arning*

discloses a technique for accessing a multi-dimensional database by creating an index

(*Arning*, abstract). *Arning* illustrates the logical structure of the multi-dimensional

database in FIG. 3 as a multi-dimensional array as a cube (*Arning*, ¶ 58). The

intersection of each axis of the cube represents a single data point based on the

dimensions defined by the axis (*Arning*, ¶ 60). However, *Arning's* intersections do <u>not</u>

include indications of a service running on a resource in a grid network. Therefore,

Arning does not teach or suggest "displaying, based on the feedback [from the grid

managers] ... columns representing the resources and having intersections with the

rows, wherein <u>the intersections between columns and the rows include indications of</u>

<u>the services running on the resources</u>" (emphasis added), as recited by independent

claim 8.

The combination of *Arning* with *Mitchell* and *IBM* fails to cure the deficiencies of

the references as a whole. Applicants understand the Examiner's position to be that

Arning discloses columns and rows, while the combination of *Mitchell* and *IBM* discloses

constituent elements of a grid network. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Moreover, Applicants note that the claimed columns, rows, and intersections are displayed based on feedback <u>from the grid managers</u>. Even assuming the combination of *Arning* with *Mitchell* and *IBM* includes the teachings alleged in the Final Office Action, <u>none</u> of the references teaches or suggests providing feedback from a grid manager and displaying information about the grid network <u>based on the feedback from the grid managers</u>. Therefore, *Mitchell*, *Arning*, and *IBM*, taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "displaying, based on the feedback [from the grid managers] ... columns representing the resources and having intersections with the rows, wherein <u>the intersections between columns and the rows include indications of the services running on the resources</u>" (emphasis added), as recited by independent claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 18, 2008   By:_____

Philip J. Hoffmann
Reg. No. 46,340